



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,724	04/15/2004	Martin J. Murphy	58651.00004	9944
7590	12/09/2004		EXAMINER	
Squire, Sander & Dempsey L.L.P. Two Renaissance Square Suite 2700 40 North Central Avenue Phoenix, AZ 85004-4498			MCELHENY JR, DONALD E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2857	
DATE MAILED: 12/09/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/825,724	MURPHY, MARTIN J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Donald E. McElheny, Jr.	2857	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 29-68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 29-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 40 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04-15-2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4-15-04 & 10-01-04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

3. Claims 29-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-11, respectively, of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,735,525. This is a double patenting rejection.

The only difference between the patented claims 1-11 and the instant claims 29-39 is seen to be the deletion of the phrase "a step for" before each method step limitation of the patent. Thus the method remains directed to the identical method steps whether or not the word "step" is recited or not. A two-way test of infringement would stand as both groups of claims directed to and covering identical disclosed and supporting subject matter of the specifications of the patent and pending application.

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 40, and 41-68 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 12-22 (respectively against each group of claims 41-51 and 52-62 of the instant application) and claims 23-28 (respectively against the group of claims 63-68 of the instant application) of U. S. Patent No. 6,735,525 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: The only difference in these claims is minor changes in the choice of language used for some limitations which may or may not have patentable distinction or difference in breadth in a court of law, such as the deletion of "means for" in front of system type claims, or change of a "step for" language to read "instructions for", and/or the addition of limitations that could be considered inherent in the patented claims, such as adding memory and processor for support of carrying out steps where such could be considered by some persons of ordinary skill in the art to implicitly be required to carry out such operations. Whether claims are directed to a computer system for carrying out an inventive algorithm, versus a method implemented as a program for being implemented on a computer system, versus the memory storage device holding a software product for being implemented on computer

system for implementing the algorithm, or combinations thereto, are all well known equivalents for carrying out the same computer related invention and amount to only the artful use of language to differently describe the same invention.

Claim 40 is addressed below as an improper claim. But however applicants intend this claim combination and its interpretation it is still the same computer related invention already patented but claimed in a different descriptive manner (as addressed by examples given above), thus are full equivalents in coverage, and furthermore such could have been presented in the parent application for consideration.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See MPEP § 804.

6. Claim 40 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 40 is directed to a "memory device", not to a method as its parent claim(s) is directed. Thus claim 40 sets forth a different statutory category of invention under 35 U.S.C. 101 than its parent claim, and thus does not clearly or properly further limit the subject matter of the parent claim subject matter as permitted under 35 U.S.C. 112, fourth paragraph, for dependent claims.

Subject to the fourth paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112, a claim in dependent form shall contain a reference to a claim previously set forth and then specify a further limitation of

Art Unit: 2857

the subject matter claimed. A claim in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which it refers. The instant claim 40 fails to comply with such fourth paragraph, as it begins with something entirely different than a prior claim and then adds limitations including reference to a prior claim.

7. See attached copies of form PTO-1449. The prior art is not seen to teach the combination and interrelationships of analysis of signal components with plurality of adjusted magnitudes and description of time domain signal corresponding to adjusted magnitudes for the multiplicity of frequency domain components.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald McElheny, Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-2218. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoff Marc, can be reached on weekdays at telephone number 571-272-2216. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2857

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Donald E. McElheny, Jr.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2857